

-17-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on November 23, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-4, 8-17, 21-27, 29, 31-32 and 34-35 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 14, 27, 29, 31 and 34 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claims 1, 14, 23, 29 and 31 have been amended, claims 6 and 19 have been cancelled and claim 35 has been added. A version of the claims containing markings to show the changes made is included hereinabove. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Preliminary Matters

The Examiner submitted that claim 34 is distinct from the invention originally claimed since it recites in part a "play time of the document". The Examiner is assuming this play time of the document is referring to the play time of an audio or video object within or associated with a document, and further that the claim is directed to synchronization of diverse media. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. The document, in some embodiments, may comprise an audio or video clip and the display of the "play time of the document" refers to the play time of the audio or video clip document, not a play time of an audio or video object associated with a document as assumed by the Examiner. There is no need or reason to perform "synchronization of diverse media" as further assumed by the Examiner. As recited in the specification as filed at page 16, line 28 through page 17, line 2:

'Alternatively, the time document property can represent a play time of an audio or video clip in which case the size document property for such content might indicate how much data storage (e.g., in kilobytes, megabytes or terabytes) the video or audio document may consume.'

Thus, the play time is another document property which is displayed and is presented to a user so the user can make an informed decision regarding which document to select from a choice of documents. Accordingly, claim 34 should not be subject to a restriction requirement.

Rejections under §103

Claims 1, 6, 8-14, 19, 21-27 and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,671,381 to Strasnick et al. (hereinafter Strasnick) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,098,064 to Pirolli et al. (hereinafter Pirolli). Strasnick, discloses at column 4, lines 11-21, a method and apparatus for displaying a three-dimensional navigable display space containing an aggregation of graphical objects and an overview of the aggregation of display objects. A data file appears as a data block within the information landscape.

Strasnick, as stated by the Examiner, does not teach a retrieval time associated with each object. The Examiner cited Pirolli, stating that Pirolli teaches a list associated with collected data regarding document retrieval times. Pirolli teaches using a document retrieval time for determining whether to prefetch and cache documents. Neither Strasnick nor Pirolli (taken alone or in combination) teach using a document retrieval time in the rendering of a document selection display to provide a correlation between a size of a document, an age of a document and a retrieval time for a document in order to provide an indication of document property relationships as recited by claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 6, namely, that the accessing and rendering are performed for a plurality of documents in a single correlation framework.

Therefore, since amended claim 1 recites using a document retrieval time in the rendering of a document selection display to provide a correlation between a size of a document, an age of a document and a retrieval time for a document in order to provide an indication of document property relationships and that the accessing and rendering are performed for a plurality of documents in a single

-19-

correlation framework, while Strasnick and Pirolli fail to do so, amended claim 1 is believed allowable over Strasnick and Pirolli. Claim 14, 27, 29 and 31 have been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 and are believed allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 6 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 8, 13, 21-26, and 32 depend from claims 1, 14 or 31 and are believed allowable for the same reasons as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 6, 8-14, 19, 21-27 and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Strasnick in view of Pirolli is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-4 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick in view of Pirolli and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,227 to Freeman et al. (hereinafter Freeman). Claims 2-4 and 15-17 depend from claims 1 or 14 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-4 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick in view of Pirolli and further in view of Freeman is believed to have been overcome.

Regarding claim 34, as stated above, Applicants believe the restriction requirement regarding this claim should be removed. Further, claim 35 has been added. Claim 35 depends from claim 34 and is believed allowable as it depends from a base claim which is believed allowable.


In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing the claims in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-20-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661
Customer No.: 58408

Attorney Docket No.: SUN01-02(P5870)

Dated: February 23, 2006